



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,608	01/29/2004	Van Hung Nguyen	60148.0011US01	5192

7590 05/09/2005

Merchant & Gould P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2831

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/767,608

Applicant(s)

NGUYEN, VAN HUNG

Examiner

Chau N. Nguyen

Art Unit

2831

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 8-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goericke et al. (DE 3333709).

Goericke et al. discloses insulation of the electrical connections of at least two flat cables (1 and 2) which comprises at least electrical strip conductors (6 and 7) and insulating material (8 and 9), wherein the insulating material is removed locally and the exposed strip conductors of the two flat cables are joined with one another, in an electrically conducting manner, of a so-called matrix (10), and wherein the matrix (10) is insulated with an insulating sealing material (3) which consists substantially of a similar material as the insulating material of the flat cables (the sealing material and the insulating material of the flat cables, both being plastic material) (re claims 1 and 9). Goericke et al. also discloses the thickness of the sealing material in the area of the matrix being between one-fifth and three fold the thickness of the insulating material of the flat cable (see Figure 2) (re claim 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 8 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steiner et al. (2004/0038598) in view of Goericke et al.

Steiner et al. discloses insulation of the electrical connections of at least two flat cables (12 and 14) which comprises at least electrical strip conductors (16, 18, 20, 24) and insulating material (26 and 28), wherein the insulating material is removed locally and the exposed strip conductors of the two flat cables are joined with one another, wherein the joined (overlapping) area is insulated with an insulating sealing material (34) which consists substantially of a similar material as the insulating material of the flat cables (the sealing material and the insulating material of the flat cables, both being plastic material) (re claim 1). Steiner et al. also discloses the at least two flat cables lying in planes that are parallel to each other (re claims 8 and 12) and the exposed strips conductors of the different flat cables being joined with one another intermediate the ends of the different cables (re claim 11).

Steiner et al. does not disclose the conductors being joined with one another in an electrically conducting manner, of a so-called matrix nor the thickness of the sealing material in the area of the matrix being between half to twice the thickness of the insulating material.

Goericke et al. discloses a connection between two flat cables, wherein the conductors are joined with one another in an electrically conducting manner, of a so-called matrix (10). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the matrix (10) taught by Goericke et al. to join the conductors of Steiner et al. to improve the electrical connection between the conductors. It would also have been obvious to one skilled in the art to choose a suitable thickness for the sealing material in the area of the matrix to meet the specific use of the resulting device since it is taught by Steiner et al. that the sealing material in the area of the joint cannot be too thick ([0037]) and since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable range involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 205 USPQ 233.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection except for the following.

Applicant argues that Goericke et al. does not disclose two flat flex cables joined with one another. This argument is not found persuasive. It is clearly shown in Figure 3 of Goericke et al. that conductors (6) of flat flex cable (1) are joined to conductors (7) of flat flex cable (2).

In response to applicant's argument that patent drawings are generally not considered as being to scale, drawings are parts of the invention disclosure and used to illustrate the claimed

Art Unit: 2831

invention. According to Figure 2 of Goericke et al., the sealing material in the area of the matrix, including the lower portion and the top portion, would have a thickness between one-fifth and threefold the thickness of the insulating material of the cable.

Summary

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau N. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1980. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

Art Unit: 2831

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext 31. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Chau N Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2831